

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHNNY JOE HARO,

Plaintiff,

v.

T. NGUYEN, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00448-EPG (PC)

ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S REPLY  
TO DEFENDANTS’ ANSWER(S)

(ECF No. 37)

Johnny Haro (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 15, 2022, defendant Jeng filed an answer to Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 27). On December 8, 2022, defendants Lai and Nguyen filed an answer to Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 32). On January 3, 2023, Plaintiff filed a reply to Defendants’ answer(s). (ECF No. 37).

Pursuant to Rule 7(a), “[o]nly these pleadings are allowed: (1) a complaint; (2) an answer to a complaint; (3) an answer to a counterclaim designated as a counterclaim; (4) an answer to a crossclaim; (5) a third-party complaint; (6) an answer to a third-party complaint; and (7) if the court orders one, a reply to an answer.”

The Court has not ordered a reply to Defendants’ answers, and declines to make such an order. Moreover, Plaintiff’s filing does not fit into any other category. Therefore, the Court will strike Plaintiff’s reply.

1 Accordingly, Plaintiff's reply to Defendants' answer(s) (ECF No. 37), is HEREBY  
2 STRICKEN from the record.

3  
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: **January 4, 2023**

/s/ Eric P. Grogan  
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE